

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Replacement sheets for FIGS. 1-7 are enclosed which formalize the drawings that were submitted with the application. No other changes have been made. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

## **REMARKS**

Drawings which formalize those currently on file are enclosed herewith. No other changes have been made. Approval by the Examiner of these drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wittman et al. (US 2004/0036856).

The Examiner's position is that Wittman et al disclose an arrangement for measuring parameters in situ and then adjusting subsequently another organic layer. At the outset, Applicants note that Wittman et al do not adjust a subsequent processing station to change the formation of a subsequent organic layer to compensate for potential defects. What Wittman et al do in paragraph 0010 is directly check the quality of the polymer layer during the printing process, modifying or correcting it if necessary. See also paragraph 0024 wherein the printing droplet size and frequency can be adjusted. Wittman et al have nothing to do with adjusting a subsequent processing station to change the formation of a subsequent organic layer. What Wittman et al do is to adjust the amount of material in a particular layer as it is being formed. Thereafter this correction is stored and when that layer is again to be repeated this correction is applied. See paragraph 0025. Thus, Wittman et al do not disclose or suggest the adjustment in a subsequent processing station to change the formation of a subsequent organic layer to compensate for potential defects in a formed layer. Applicants can find no motivation in Wittman et al for the subject matter set forth in claim 1. In paragraph 0009 Wittman et al indicate that there is a problem when making correction in subsequent processing stations. This clearly indicates that Wittman et al teach away from the present invention. Wittman et al can only correct within their currently processed layer where too little material is being deposited. However, the present invention can correct for the situation where too much material was deposited by reducing the amount of material provided by a subsequent processing station.

Claims 2 and 5-12 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang (US 5,937,272) in view of Wittman et al.

Wittman et al have been discussed above. Tang does relate to the use of radiation transfer to transfer organic material from a donor to a substrate. Tang does not disclose or suggest that a formed layer can be measured in situ to

produce a signal which can be used to adjust a subsequent processing station. Clearly, then there is no reason to combine Wittman et al and Tang and even if they could be combined they would not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in claims 2 and 5-12. The Examiner's attention is directed to claim 7 which in element (b) requires testing the donor or the organic layer or both to determine if insufficient material was or will be transferred. Wittman et al do not disclose the use of a donor and Tang sets forth no testing techniques. Accordingly it is believed that claim 7 defines unobvious subject matter. In claim 11, the donor alone is tested to determine a defect in the donor and then in step (b) only those acceptable portions of the donor are used by excluding identified defective portions of the donor. Nothing in either of the references would suggest this arrangement which is also believed to define unobvious subject matter.

All of the independent claims in this application have been discussed and are believed to have unobvious subject matter. The remaining claims each depend upon one of the independent claims and should be allowed along with them.

If there are any problems with this response, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond L. Owens  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 22,363

RLO/das  
Telephone 585-477-4653  
Facsimile 585-477-4646  
Enclosure

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.